

GILEAD

SCIENCES

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 29 2006

FAX COVER SHEET

THIS FACSIMILE AND THE INFORMATION IT CONTAINS ARE INTENDED TO BE A CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION ONLY TO THE PERSON OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS FACSIMILE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY THE SENDER BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL FAX TO THIS OFFICE BY MAIL.

Intellectual Property Department

Fax (650) 522-5575

Date: June 29, 2006 **Fax #:** (571) 273-8300

Deliver to: Examiner Kailash Srivastava **Company:** Commissioner for Patents
Group 1655 P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Subject: In re application of Becker et al.
Serial No. 10/798,692
Filed: March 11, 2004
Attorney Docket No. 249.P1C2

From: Max D. Hensley, Reg. 27,043

Number of Pages (including cover page): 5

Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper along with the following documents are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office as of the date indicated below.

Response to Advisory Action with Attachment (1 page)

Vicki Collins

Type or print name of person signing certification

Vicki Collins

Signature

June 29, 2006

Date

If there are any problems with transmission, or if any pages are missing,
please contact the sender at (650) 522-5535.
333 Lakeside Drive, Foster City, California 94404, USA

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 29 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of)	Group Art Unit: 1655
)	Attorney Docket No. 249.P1C2
Becker, et al.)	Examiner: Dr. K. Srivastava
)	
Serial No: 10/798,692)	
)	Customer No. 25000
Filed: March 11, 2004)	
)	
Title: PRODRUGS OF PHOSPHONATE)	
<u>NUCLEOTIDE ANALOGUES</u>)	

RESPONSE TO ADVISORY ACTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants filed a reply to the outstanding Final Rejection on April 13, 2006, and a Notice of Appeal on June 23, 2006. Accordingly, the brief is due August 23, 2006.

The Final Rejection (issued by a different examiner, Ms. Louise Leary) provisionally rejected on double patenting grounds claims 35, 36 and 44-45. Certain of these provisional rejections were indicated to be new grounds of rejection. The Final also contained a new ground of "objection" of claims 38-41 (see page 3 of the Final Rejection).

The Final Rejection appeared to be premature because of the new grounds of rejection, but since the Office's concerns were largely moot, clearly misdirected and/or were readily resolved by amendment, no further action was taken by applicants in that regard. Contrary to Examiner Leary's comment in the Final Rejection, the rejections on new double patenting grounds were not necessitated by applicants' amendment prior to the Final Rejection. The Final Rejection indicated that claims 34, 37, 42, 43, 46 and 47 were allowed.